arXiv:0708.1550v1 [math.CV] 11 Aug 2007

Liouville-type theorems for foliations with complex leaves

Giuseppe Della Sala

February 1, 2008

Introduction

In this paper we discuss some structure problems regarding the foliation of Levi flat manifolds, i.e. those CR manifolds which are foliated by complex leaves or, equivalently, whose Levi form vanishes. Levi flat manifolds have a particular significance among CR manifolds, since - due to their degenerate nature - they often behave as "limit case", or they are an obstruction in extension problems of CR objects (see, for example, [3]). The geometry of Levi flat manifolds is a source of many interesting problems (see [2], [1]).

Here, we address the following general question: assuming that a Levi flat submanifold $S \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded in some directions, what can be said about its foliation? We will show that, in some circumstances, it is possible to conclude that the foliation (or even, more generally, a complex leaf of a foliated manifold) is "trivial", i.e. is made up by complex planes. A first result in this direction is the following

Theorem 0.1 *Let S be a smooth Levi-flat hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^n = \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}_w$, contained in $C = \{|w| < 1\}$ and closed in $\overline{C}$. Then S is foliated by hyperplanes $\{w = const.\}$.*

In order to treat this problem it is useful to consider S as an *analytic multifunction*. These objects, which were first introduced by Oka [4], are set-valued functions $\mathbb{C} \to \mathbf{k}(\mathbb{C})$ (where $\mathbf{k}(\mathbb{C})$ denote the subset of the power set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C})$ formed by the compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}$) which behave in some ways as analytic function; namely, according to Oka's definition, the complementary of their graph is pseudoconvex. However, we will find more convenient to adopt as a definition the characterization found by Slodkowski [7] by means of plurisubharmonic (psh) functions.

We shall see that Theorem 0.1 becomes then a rather easy consequence of the results already obtained for analytic multifunctions, namely, the extension of Liouville's theorem to such objects. Then, we generalize Theorem 0.1 to higher codimension (see Theorem 1.3) by a slightly less trivial application of the Liouville Theorem.

Later on, we will discuss other related problems which cannot be treated by means of analytic multifunctions. In section 2, we consider the case of a (complex leaf of a) foliation of the graph of a bounded function on $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. In this case, an analysis of each single complex leaf is required. Afterwards, in section 3 we consider a (real) foliation of $D \times \mathbb{C}$ by complex leaves, and we show that under suitable (maybe too restrictive) geometric conditions on this foliation it is again possible to prove a triviality result.

Acknowledgements

This paper would not have been written without the help of G.Tomassini, who suggested the problems and gave many important advices.
I also wish to thank N.Shcherbina for several helpful talks, expecially for the idea of adopting the methods of analytic multifunctions.

1 Levi flat manifolds contained in a cylinder

1.1 Analytic multifunctions and Liouville Theorem

Consider a function $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C})$, i.e. a set-valued function from $\mathbb{C}^n$ to the power set of $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\Gamma(f) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be defined as

$$\Gamma(f) = \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^n} \{z\} \times f(z).$$

We say that f is an *analytic multifunction* if each value $f(z)$ is a compact set and $\mathbb{C}^{n+1} \setminus \Gamma(f)$ is pseudoconvex. With this definition, a holomorphic function $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is clearly an analytic multifunction.

Let $\rho : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous plurisubharmonic function. Let $\rho' : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$\rho'(z) = \max_{w \in f(z)} \rho(w).$$

In [7] the following is proved :

Lemma 1.1 *For any analytic multifunction f and continuous psh function ρ, ρ' is a plurisubharmonic function.*

From now on, by analytic multifunction we mean a multifunction for which the conclusion of Lemma 1.1 holds true.

The following Liouville result (see also [5]) on analytic multifunction depends only on the property of Lemma 1.1:

Lemma 1.2 *Let f be an analytic multifunction on $\mathbb{C}^n$, and suppose that f is bounded in the following sense:*

$$\Gamma(f) \subset \{|w| < M\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$$

for some $M > 0$. Let $\hat{f}$ be the multifunction defined as

$$\hat{f}(z) = \widehat{f(z)}, \;\; z \in \mathbb{C}^n$$

where $\widehat{K}$ is the polynomial hull of K. Then $\hat{f}$ is constant.

Proof. Let $P(w)$ be a polynomial on $\mathbb{C}_w$, and denote again by P the trivial extension of P to $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ $P(z,w) = P(z)$. Then $|P|$ is a plurisubharmonic function on $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, therefore by Lemma 1.1

$$P'(z) = \max\{|P(w)| : w \in f(z)\}$$

is psh on $\mathbb{C}^n$. But, defining

$$C = \max_{|w| \leq M} P(w)$$

we have that $P'(z) \leq C$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then, by Liouville's Theorem for psh functions it follows that P' is constant. We deduce that $\hat{f}$ is constant. Indeed, in the opposite case we could find $w_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $w_1 \in (\hat{f}(z_1) \setminus \hat{f}(z_2))$, i.e. there would exist a polynomial P_1 such that

$$|P_1(w_1)| > \max_{\hat{f}(z_2)} |P_1|,$$

hence

$$P_1'(z_2) < |P_1(w_1)| \leq P_1'(z_2)$$

which is a contradiction. $\square$

Example 1.1 The hypothesis of Lemma 1.2 does not imply that f is in turn a constant multifunction. A simple example is the following:

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \{|w| = 1\}, & z \neq 0; \\ \{|w| \leq 1\}, & z = 0. \end{cases}$$

Example 1.2 A modification of the previous example shows that, even if $\Gamma(f)$ is a (disconnected) manifold, f need not be constant if we adopt the second definition of analytic multifunction (i.e. the property discussed in Lemma 1.1). Indeed, define $f(z)$ to be the union of the unit circle bD and any compact set contained in the unit disc D; then, since any subharmonic function can "detect" the behavior of f only in bD, f satisfies the statement of Lemma 1.1 but the complement is not pseudoconvex. As we show below, nevertheless, the result holds if $\Gamma(f)$ has the structure of a (even disconnected) Levi flat manifold (which is obviously not the case in the previous example).

Lemma 1.2 provides a useful tool which allows to prove Theorem 0.1 quite easily. In fact, setting

$$f_S(\zeta) = S \cap \{z = \zeta\}$$

for $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ we have that f_S is by definition an analytic multifunction.

Proof of Theorem 0.1. By hypothesis the multifunction f_S is bounded, therefore in view of Liouville's Theorem $\hat{f}_S$ is constant. We have to show that the multifunction f_S is constant, too. In order to do this, choose $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ in such a way that the complex line $L_{z_0} = \{z = z_0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ intersects S transversally. This means that $f(z_0)$ is a smooth compact real 1-submanifold of $\mathbb{C}$, i.e. a finite set $\{\lambda_i(z_0)\}_{1 \le i \le k(z_0)}$ of simple C^∞ loops contained in $D = \{|w| < 1\}$. Let $U_i(z_0)$ be the bounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \lambda_i(z_0)$, and let $\{\alpha_j(z_0)\}_{1 \le j \le h(z_0)}$ be the "maximal"loops, i.e. those λ_i's which are not contained in any U_j. For every $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $L_z \cap S$ is transversal, adopting the same notations as above we define

$$\mathcal{M}(z) = \bigcup_{1 \le i \le h(z)} \alpha_i(z).$$

Let $I \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be the set of $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for which

- L_z has transversal intersection with $\bigcup_\zeta \mathcal{M}(\zeta)$;
- $\mathcal{M}(z) = \mathcal{M}(z_0)$.

It suffices to show that I is both open and closed. Indeed, in this case $f'_S(z) = f_S(z) \setminus \mathcal{M}(z)$ is an analytic multifunction, thus we can prove the statement of 0.1 inductively, where the induction is performed on the number of loops of $f(z_0)$.

$\underline{I \text{ is open}}$. Let $z_1 \in I$; clearly there exists a neighborhood Ω of z_1 such that $h(z) = h(z_1) \equiv h$ for $z \in \Omega$ and $\mathcal{M}_\Omega = \bigcup_{z \in \Omega} \mathcal{M}(z)$ is a submanifold of $\Omega \times \mathbb{C}_w$ for which $L_z \cap \mathcal{M}_\Omega$ is transversal. Moreover, observe that if $\{V_i(z)\}_{1 \le i \le h}$ are the connected components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \alpha_i(z)$, then $\hat{f}(z) = \bigcup_i V_i(z)$. This implies immediately that $\mathcal{M}(z)$ is constant on Ω.

$\underline{I \text{ is closed}}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_I = \bigcup_{z \in I} \mathcal{M}_z$ and let $z_2 \in \overline{I}$. Then, $\overline{\mathcal{M}_I} \cap L_{z_2} = \mathcal{M}(z_0)$; moreover, since S is a smooth manifold, we have

$$T_{(z_2,w')}(S) \supset \{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} : w = w'\}$$

for every $w' \in f(z_0)$. But, since we clearly have $\overline{\mathcal{M}_I} \cap L_{z_2} = \mathcal{M}(z_2)$, this implies that $L_{z_2} \cap \mathcal{M}$ is transversal, i.e. $z_2 \in I$. $\square$

1.2 Higher codimension

The analogous of Theorem 0.1 for Levi flat surfaces S of higher codimension can also be proved by following the same methods. However, in this case, analyticity of the multifunction f_S defined by S is more involved, due to the fact that S is no longer pseudoconvex. Also the proof of the fact that f_S is constant whenever $\hat{f}_S$ is needs to be adapted using [8] (see the proof of Theorem 1.3).

We consider a real $(2d-1)$-codimensional submanifold $S \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+d} \cong \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^d$, with coordinates $z_1, \ldots, z_n, w_1, \ldots, w_d$.

Theorem 1.3 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+d}$ be a $(2d-1)$-codimensional Levi flat submanifold (i.e. foliated by complex leaves of dimension n), contained in*

$$C = \{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+d} : \sum_{i=1}^{d} |w_i|^2 < 1\}$$

and closed in $\overline{C}$. Then S is foliated by coordinate complex n-planes $\{w_1 = c_1, \ldots, w_d = c_d\}$.

Let $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be a function from $\mathbb{C}^n$ to the subsets of $\mathbb{C}^d$, $d \geq 2$. We recall that, according to our definition, f is an analytic multifunction if $f(z)$ is compact for each $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and, for every continuous plurisubharmonic function $\rho : \mathbb{C}^{n+d} \to \mathbb{R}$, the function $\rho' : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\rho'(z) = \max_{f(z)} \rho(z,w)$$

is plurisubharmonic (see Lemma 1.1).

Let L_z, $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, be the vertical complex d-plane over z i.e.

$$L_z = \{(\zeta, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+d} : \zeta = z\}.$$

Consider the set-valued function f_S defined by $f_S(z) = L_z \cap S$ (generically, $f_S(z)$ is the union of a finite number of loops). We want to show that f_S is an analytic multifunction.

Lemma 1.4 *f_S is an analytic multifunction.*

Proof. Let $\rho : \mathbb{C}^{n+d} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a psh function, and define ρ' as above. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a complex line passing through z_0. For a generic choice of $\mathcal{L}$, the intersection of S with the complex $(d+1)$-plane

$$\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+d} : z \in \mathcal{L}\}$$

is transversal, and thus a Levi flat submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^{d+1}$. Therefore, since it is sufficient to show that the restriction of ρ' to a generic $\mathcal{L}$ is subharmonic, we can suppose $n = 1$.

Assume, then, that f_S is a $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}^d)$-valued multifunction defined over $\mathbb{C}_z$, and fix $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. If $w \in f(z_0)$, we denote by Σ_w the leaf of the foliation of S through w. Two cases are possible:

- $T_{(z_0,w)}(\Sigma_w) \not\subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$;
- $T_{(z_0,w)}(\Sigma_w) \subset \mathbb{C}^d$.

In the former, for a sufficiently small neighborhood $V_w = (\Delta \times U)_w$ of (z_0, w) we have that $\Sigma_w \cap V_w$ can be written

$$\Sigma_w \cap V_w = \{(z, w) \in \Delta \times U : w_1 = g_1^w(z), \dots, w_d = g_d^w(z)\}$$

for some holomorphic function $g_i^w \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta)$. Moreover, observe that for $w' \in f(z_0)$ in a small enough neighborhood $\mathcal{W}_w$ of w, we can choose a Δ which does not depend on w'.

In the latter, consider the restriction of the projection $\pi : \mathbb{C}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{C}$ to a small neighborhood $\mathcal{V}_w$ of (z_0, w) in Σ_w. We can suppose that $\mathcal{V}_w$ is a local chart such that $(z_0, w) \cong 0$. Denote by ζ the complex coordinate on $\mathcal{V}_w$. Since $\pi|_{\mathcal{V}_w}$ is a holomorphic function and its prime derivative vanishes at 0, there exists $k \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial \zeta} \pi|_{\mathcal{V}_w} = 0, \ \frac{\partial^{k+1}}{\partial \zeta} \pi|_{\mathcal{V}_w} \neq 0.$$

Otherwise, we would have $\pi|_{\mathcal{V}_w} \equiv z_0$ and thus Σ_w would be a complex line contained in $\mathbb{C}^d$, which is impossible since it must be contained in the cylinder C of Theorem 1.3. It follows that $\pi|_{\mathcal{V}_w}$ is a k-sheeted covering over some neighborhood Δ of z_0. Now, the restriction of π to the leaves $\Sigma_{w'}$ passing through the points (z_0, w') of a small neighborhood of (z_0, w) can be interpreted as a smooth one-parameter family of holomorphic functions

$\pi_t : \mathcal{V}_k \to \mathbb{C}_z$, such that $\pi_0 = \pi$. For $|t| << 1$, the argument principle implies that the sum of the orders of the zeroes of $(\partial/\partial\zeta)\pi_t$ is still $k-1$. This in turn means that for w' sufficiently close to w the projection $\pi|_{\Sigma_{w'}}$ is still a k-sheeted covering over some neighborhood $\Delta_{w'}$; in a sufficiently small neighborhood $\mathcal{W}_w$ we can assume to have chosen a Δ independent from w'.

Since $f(z_0)$ is a compact set, we can choose finitely many open sets as above, $\mathcal{W}_{w_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{W}_{w_h}$, in such a way that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{h} \mathcal{W}_{w_i} = f(z_0).$$

Choose a disc $\Delta \subset \Delta_{w_1} \cap \ldots \cap \Delta_{w_h}$. We claim that ρ' is plurisubharmonic on Δ. In order to prove this, choose $w \in f(z_0)$:

- if $w \in \mathcal{W}_{w_j}$ with w_j of the first kind, then we define
$$\rho^j_w = \rho|_{\Sigma_w \cap \pi^{-1}(\Delta)};$$
- if $w \in \mathcal{W}_{w_j}$ with w_j of the second kind, we define
$$\rho^j_w = (\max_{\Sigma_w \cap \pi^{-1}(\Delta_{w_j})} \rho(z,w))|_\Delta.$$

In both cases, ρ^j_w is a psh function. Observe that it may occur $\rho^i_w \neq \rho^j_w$ when $i \neq j$. Nevertheless, consider

$$\varrho(z) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq h, w \in f(z_0)} \rho^i_w; \tag{1}$$

we have to show that $\varrho(z) = \rho'(z)$. A priori, the maximum in equation (1) may be performed, for $z \neq z_0$, on a proper subset of $f(z)$, due to the possible existence of leaves of S which accumulate to $f(z_0)$ without intersecting it. However, this does not happen. This is a consequence of the fact that

$$\bigcup_{w \in f(z_0)} \Sigma_w \cap \pi^{-1}(\Delta) = S \cap \pi^{-1}(\Delta)$$

as proved in Lemma 1.5 below. It follows that $\varrho(z) = \rho'(z)$. Since we already know that $\rho'(z)$ is continuous, (1) implies $\rho'(z)$ is plurisubharmonic. □

Lemma 1.5 *Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_z$, and let Σ be a leaf of the foliation of S such that $z_0 \in \overline{\pi(\Sigma)}$. Then $z_0 \in \pi(\Sigma)$.*

Proof. Observe that, since $\Sigma \subset C$, and consequently the w-coordinates are bounded on Σ, there exists $w \in f(z_0)$ such that (z_0, w) is a cluster point for Σ. Take a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of (z_0, w) such that the foliation is trivial on $S \cap \mathcal{U}$. Then $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{U}$ is a union of leaves of this trivial foliation. Let Σ_0 be the leaf of $S \cap \mathcal{U}$ passing through (z_0, w); then, either Σ contains Σ_0 or it contains a sequence of leaves that converges to Σ_0. Suppose that the second case occurs. Arguing as in the previous Lemma, we show that Σ_0 is not "vertical" i.e. it is not contained in $\mathbb{C}^d$. Then $\pi(\Sigma_0)$ is a open set containing z_0; but for Σ' close enough to Σ_0, $\pi(\Sigma')$ is an open set containing z_0. This proves the thesis. $\square$

Lemma 1.4 allows to prove, exactly in the same way as before, that $\hat{f}_S$ is a constant multifunction. We have to show, again, that this fact forces f_S to be constant.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Observe that, for z belonging to a dense, open subset J of $\mathbb{C}^n$, L_z intersects S transversally. For $z \in J$, $f(z) = L_z \cap S$ is the disjoint union of a finite set $\{\gamma_i(z)\}_{1 \le i \le k(z)}$ of loops in $\mathbb{C}^d$. It is a well-known fact ([8]) that, in this case, the polynomial hull $\hat{f}(z)$ of $f(z)$ is given by the union of some of the loops γ_i and some complex varieties Λ_j whose boundaries are the others γ_i's. We choose the minimal subsets of loops $\{\alpha_i(z)\}_{1 \le i \le h(z)}$ such that, if $\mathcal{M}(z) = \alpha_1 \cup \ldots \cup \alpha_{h(z)}$, then $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(z) = \hat{f}(z)$. Observe that $\mathcal{M}(z)$ is univocally defined. It is sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{M}(z)$ is constant, because in such a case we can proceed inductively as in the proof of Theorem 0.1. In view of the structure of the hull $\hat{f}_S(z)$, it is clear that $\mathcal{M}(z)$ is constant for $z \in J$. Moreover, arguing again as in 0.1, it is clear that

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_z \mathcal{M}(z)$$

is a manifold with transversal intersection with L_z also for $z \in \overline{J}$. It follows that $\mathcal{M}$, and therefore f_S, is constant. $\square$

2 Foliation of a graph

Consider, in $\mathbb{C}^2$, coordinates (z, w) with $z = x + iy$ and $w = u + iv$. We denote by π the projection $\pi : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}_z$ and by τ the projection $\tau : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$. Let $\rho : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that

$$S = \{v = \rho(z, u)\}$$

is a Levi flat graph. Then the leaves of the foliation associated to S are regular (immersed) complex manifolds of dimension 1. We claim that the following holds true:

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose that $|\rho|$ is bounded by some constant M; then S is foliated by complex lines, i.e. ρ has the form*

$$\rho(z, u) = \varrho(u)$$

for some smooth function $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Actually, we are going to prove a sharper result. If S is any foliated 3-submanifold, we say that a leaf Σ of S is *properly embedded* if, for (almost) every ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, the connected components of $\overline{B} \cap \Sigma$ are compact, embedded submanifolds of $\overline{B} \cap S$ with boundary. We say that the foliation of S is *proper* if the leaves are properly embedded.

Theorem 2.2 *Let $S = \{v = \rho(z, u)\}$ be a properly foliated hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^2$, and suppose that ρ is bounded. Then every complex leaf of S is a complex line.*

Theorem 2.1 is a consequence of Theorem 2.2, the foliation of a Levi flat graph being proper (see, for example, the main Theorem of [6]). A simple proof of 2.1 can be given using analytic multifunctions.
Proof of Theorem 2.1. By hypothesis there exists a complex line $\{w = c\}$ such that S lies outside the cylinder

$$C = \{(z, w) : |w - c| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Then, we can perform a rational change of coordinates (acting only on the w-coordinate) such that the image S' of S is contained in $\mathbb{C}_z \times D_w$, where D_w is the unit disc. The complement of

$$\overline{S}' = S' \cup (\mathbb{C}_z \times \{0\})$$

in $\mathbb{C}_z \times D_w$ is pseudoconvex. Indeed, a psh exhaustion function φ for S on $\mathbb{C}^2$ induces a psh exhaustion function φ' for S' on $\mathbb{C}_z \times (D_w \setminus \{0\})$; then

$$\psi = \max\{\varphi' \left|\frac{1}{w}\right|\}$$

is a psh exhaustion function for $\overline{S}'$ on $\mathbb{C}_z \times D_w$. The rest of the proof can be carried out in the same way as in Theorem 0.1, with some additional care due to the fact that, if f is the multifunction representing S', in general $f(z)$ is no longer a C^1 curve but only a C^0 one. $\square$

It is clear that Theorem 2.2 cannot be treated by applying the methods of analytic multifunctions. As already observed, its proof requires an accurate analysis of a single leaf.

2.1 Preliminary results

First of all, we show the following

Lemma 2.3 *Let Σ be any complex leaf of the foliation of S. Then the projection $\pi|_\Sigma$ is a local homeomorphism.*

Proof. Let $p \in \Sigma$, $p = (p_z, p_w)$; it suffices to show that the differential of $\pi|\Sigma$ is surjective in p. In the opposite case, there would exist neighborhoods U of p in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and V of p_w in $\mathbb{C}_w$, and a holomorphic function $f : V \to \mathbb{C}$ such that, denoting by Σ' the connected component of $\Sigma \cap U$ which contains p, we would have

$$\Sigma' = \{z = f(w)\}$$

and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial w}(p_w) = 0$. In other words, $\partial/\partial w \in T_p^{\mathbb{C}}(\Sigma)$ and thus $\partial/\partial v \in T_p(\Sigma)$. This would imply

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \in T_p(S),$$

which contradicts the fact that ρ is a smooth function on $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3 shows that a complex leaf Σ of the foliation is locally a graph over $\mathbb{C}_z$, but, since we do not know whether or not $\pi : \Sigma \to \mathbb{C}_z$ is actually a covering, we cannot conclude immediately that $\pi|_\Sigma^{-1}$ is single-valued. However, if this is the case, it is easy to deduce that the thesis of Theorem 2.1 holds true for Σ, provided that the projection $\pi|_\Sigma$ is onto:

Lemma 2.4 *Let Σ be a complex leaf of S, and suppose that*

- $\pi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{C}_z$;
- *for every $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_z$, $\pi^{-1}(z_0) \cap \Sigma$ is a single point.*

Then there exists $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\Sigma = \{w = c\}.$$

Proof. Indeed, in this case the leaf Σ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$ as $\pi|_\Sigma$ is one to one; then, denoting by v the projection on the v-coordinate, $v \circ (\pi|_\Sigma)^{-1}$ is a harmonic, bounded function on $\mathbb{C}_z$, which is constant by Liouville's Theorem. Therefore $v|_\Sigma$ is also constant and so is $u|_\Sigma$, which is conjugate to v in Σ. $\square$

Remark 2.1 One may ask whether the latter hypothesis in Lemma 2.4 can be replaced by

- $\pi|_\Sigma$ is a local homeomorphism.

This is not the case, as it is shown by the following example.

Example 2.1 Consider the subset

$$L = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |y| < 1\}.$$

It is simple to show that there exists a map $\phi : L \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

- ϕ is onto;
- the differential of ϕ is always invertible;
- ϕ extends as a continuous function $\overline{L} \to \mathbb{C}$;
- $\phi^{-1}(z)$ consists of finitely many point for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

In order to be convinced of this fact, one may proceed as follows. A map of this kind can be identified with the smooth motion of an open segment on $\mathbb{C}$ along a curve parametrized by $\mathbb{R}_x$. For instance, we can first cover a ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ by this motion, and then let the segment proceed along a suitably chosen spiral to fill in the whole $\mathbb{C}$.

Then, denoting by J the standard complex structure on $\mathbb{C}$, we can endow L with the complex structure $\phi^\star(J)$, thus obtaining a simply connected open Riemann surface $L_\mathbb{C}$ for which $\phi : L_\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is tautologically holomorphic. By Riemann's uniformization Theorem, we find a biholomorphism $\psi : L_\mathbb{C} \to X$ where X is either $\mathbb{C}$ or the unit disc $D \subset \mathbb{C}$. We claim that the first case cannot occur. Indeed, consider the set

$$A_\varepsilon = L_\mathbb{C} \cap D((0, 1), \varepsilon)$$

where $D((0, 1), \varepsilon)$ is a disc with center $(0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and radius $\varepsilon << 1$. If ε is small enough, A_ε is mapped by ϕ biholomorphically onto an open set of $\mathbb{C}$. Moreover, consider $\psi(A_\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$, and observe that the boundary of

$\psi(A_\varepsilon)$ contains $\{\infty\}$ and (for small ε) $0 \notin \psi(A_\varepsilon)$. If $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$ is a fundamental system of neighborhoods of

$$\overline{A}_\varepsilon \cap \{y = 1\}$$

in $\overline{A}_\varepsilon$, it is also clear that the sets $\psi(\mathcal{U}_n)$ approach $\infty \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ as $n \to +\infty$. Let $g \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ be such that $g(\infty) = 0$ and $g \not\equiv 0$. Then, in view of the previous observations, the function $f \in \mathcal{O}(\phi(A_\varepsilon))$ defined by $f = g \circ \psi \circ \phi^{-1}$ is continuous up to $\phi(\{y = 1\})$, and vanishes on this set. This is a contradiction (see also Lemma 2.14).

It follows that $X = D$. Let $i : D \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be defined as

$$i(z) = (\phi \circ \psi^{-1}(z), z);$$

then i is a holomorphic embedding of D in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and we set $\Sigma = i(D)$. Observe that $\pi : \Sigma \to \mathbb{C}$ is onto and a local homeomorphism; moreover, by construction $|v| < 1$ on Σ. It is clear that,for topological reasons, Σ cannot be the leaf of any foliation of a graph in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 our aim is to apply Lemma 2.4 and so, from now on, we shall focus on a single complex leaf Σ of the foliation of S and we will prove that its projection over $\mathbb{C}_z$ is a biholomorphism.

We set

$$\pi(\Sigma) = \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}_z;$$

Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{C}_z$.

We suppose, by contradiction, that $\Omega \subsetneq \mathbb{C}_z$, and let $z_0 \in b\Omega$. The following result shows that z_0 must actually belong to Ω at least in some special case, thus proving that $b(\Omega) = \emptyset$ in such a situation.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_z$ and suppose that there exist p_0 such that $\pi(p_0) = z_0$ and p_0 is a cluster point for Σ. Then $z_0 \in \Omega$.*

Remark 2.2 Since we do not know, at this stage, whether or not Σ is a closed submanifold, it is a priori possible that $p_0 \notin \Sigma$. Nevertheless, $\pi^{-1}(z_0) \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Let V be a neighborhood of p_0 on which the foliation of $S \cap V$ is trivial. Then, either $\Sigma \cap V$ has finitely many connected components - in this case one of them must contain p_0 - or the connected components of $\Sigma \cap V$ accumulate to the leaf Σ' of $S \cap V$ containing p_0. Then Σ' must be a complex leaf, too. Thus, from Lemma 2.3 it follows that, if $V' \Subset V$ ($p_0 \in V'$)

is small enough, all the leaves of $S \cap V'$ intersect (possibly in V) $\pi^{-1}(z_0)$. By hypothesis

$$V' \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset,$$

thus Σ contains a leaf of $S \cap V'$, therefore

$$\pi^{-1}(z_0) \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset.$$

□

In section 2.3, applying the results of [6], we will prove that $\pi|_{\Sigma}^{-1}$ is single-valued. Then, given $z \in \Omega$, we will denote by $w(z)$ (respectively $u(z)$,$v(z)$) the w-coordinates (resp. the u- and v-coordinate) of $\pi|_{\Sigma}^{-1}(z)$. With these notations, we can state the following straightforward corollary of Lemma 2.5:

Corollary 2.6 *Let* $z_0 \in b\Omega$, *and let* $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a fundamental system of neighborhoods of* z_0 *in* $\mathbb{C}_z$. *Then, for any* $M > 0$ *there exists* $K \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $|w(z)| > M$ *for all* $z \in \Omega \cap \mathcal{U}_k$ *with* $k \geq K$.

Proof. Otherwise, there would exist $M > 0$ and a sequence $\{z_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

- $z_n \in \Omega$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $z_n \to z_0$;
- for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $p_n \in \Sigma$ such that $\pi(p_n) = z_n$ and $|w(p_n)| \leq M$.

Then $\{p_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ would admit an accumulation point p_0 in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $\pi(p_0) = z_0$. By Lemma 2.5 this would imply $z_0 \in \Omega$, a contradiction. □

Since, by the main hypothesis, $v(z)$ is bounded on Ω, it follows immediately

Corollary 2.7 *Let* $z_0 \in b\Omega$, *and let* $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a fundamental system of neighborhoods of* z_0 *in* $\mathbb{C}_z$. *Then for any* $M > 0$ *there exists* $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $|u(z)| > M$ *for all* $z \in \Omega \cap \mathcal{U}_k$ *with* $k \geq K_0$.

Remark 2.3 In any case, since $\Omega \cap \mathcal{U}_k$ needs not be connected even for large k, it is possible that u assumes both signs in every neighborhood of z_0. Later on we are going to prove that it is not the case.

2.2 Unbounded harmonic functions on the disc

Our strategy is now to reduce our situation to a problem on the disc. For this, we will need some results about holomorphic functions on $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$.

The following one shows that a conjugate to a bounded harmonic function on D, although not necessarily bounded, cannot go to infinity on too "large" a subset of the boundary.

Lemma 2.8 *Let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D)$, $u = Ref$ and $v = Imf$. Suppose that there exists a non-constant arc γ in bD such that for every $M > 0$ there exist a neighborhood U_M of γ in $\mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$u(z) > M \ \forall z \in U_M \cap D.$$

Then v is not bounded on D.

Proof. Taking polar coordinates (r, θ), we may assume that

$$\gamma = \{r = 1, -\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon\}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the family of arcs

$$\gamma_t = \{r = t, -\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon\}$$

and set (for $t < 1$)

$$I_t = \int_{\gamma_t} u(\theta) d\theta$$

the hypothesis of the Lemma implies that $I_t \to +\infty$ as $t \to 1$. Take $\overline{t} > 0$; then, if we define (for $t > \overline{t}$) $J_t = I_t - I_{\overline{t}}$, we have

$$\int_{\overline{t} \leq r \leq t, -\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} dr d\theta = \int_{-\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon} \left(\int_{\overline{t} \leq r \leq t} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} dr \right) d\theta =$$

$$= \int_{-\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon} (u(t, \theta) - u(\overline{t}, \theta)) d\theta = I_t - I_{\overline{t}} = J_t$$

and $J_t \to +\infty$ as $t \to 1$. Thus, by the integral mean value Theorem, for all $N > 0$ there exist $t' > \overline{t}$ such that

$$\int_{-\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(t', \theta) d\theta > N.$$

On the other hand, in view of Cauchy-Riemann equations we have $u_r = -v_\theta$ and consequently

$$\int_{-\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(t', \theta) d\theta = \int_{-\varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \varepsilon} -\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(t', \theta) d\theta = v(t', -\varepsilon) - v(t', \varepsilon),$$

whence v is unbounded. $\square$

Example 2.2 The previous result fails to be true if we drop any hypothesis which guarantees that u goes to infinity on a sufficiently large subset of the boundary of D. A simple example is the following. Consider the set

$$L = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |y| < 1\}$$

and choose a biholomorphism $\phi : L \to D$. Then

$$u = x \circ \phi^{-1} : D \to \mathbb{R}$$

is a harmonic function, conjugate to

$$v = y \circ \phi^{-1} : D \to \mathbb{R};$$

but u is not bounded while $|v| < 1$ on D. In this case, the upper and lower level sets of u approach (two) isolated points on bD, rather than segments of positive measure.

2.3 Analysis of Ω

Our purpose now is to show that Ω is simply connected, which will allow us to apply Riemann's mapping Theorem and then Lemma 2.8. In order to achieve this we apply some of the results of [6], in particular the in-depth analysis which is carried out therein on the leaves of the foliation of the Levi-flat solution for graphs. First of all, we prove that $\pi|_{\Sigma}^{-1}$ is actually single-valued over Ω.

Lemma 2.9 *Let* Ω *and* Σ *be as above. Then* $\pi|_{\Sigma}^{-1}(z)$ *consists of a point for every* $z \in \Omega$*.*

Proof. Suppose that, for some $z \in \Omega$, there exist $p, q \in \Sigma$ ($p \neq q$) such that $\pi(p) = \pi(q) = z$. Since, by definition, Σ is connected, there exists an arc $\widetilde{\gamma}$ which joins p and q. Let $\gamma = \pi \circ \widetilde{\gamma}$ be the corresponding loop in Ω. Let B be a ball in $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$, centered at z, with a large enough radius such that $\gamma \subset B$ and $\tau \circ \widetilde{\gamma} \subset B$. Then

$$S \cap \tau^{-1}(B) = \Gamma(\rho|_B) \subset \mathbb{C}^2$$

is the Levi flat surface which has the graph

$$S \cap \tau^{-1}(bB) = \Gamma(\rho|_{bB})$$

as boundary. By the results in [6], we conclude that each leaf of the foliation is properly embedded in $S \cap \tau^{-1}(B)$ (observe that, under the hypothesis of

Theorem 2.2, this fact is granted by our assumption) and, therefore, that $\tau(\Sigma)$ is properly embedded in B. By the choice of B, $\tau(p)$ and $\tau(q)$ belong to the same connected component of $\tau(\Sigma) \cap B$; let Σ' be this component. Lemma 2.3 implies that Σ' is locally a graph over $\mathbb{C}_z$; since B is convex, by virtue of Lemma 3.2 in [6] we deduce that Σ' is globally a graph over some subdomain of Ω. Since $\tau(p)$ and $\tau(q)$ have the same projection over Ω, it follows $\tau(p) = \tau(q)$ and consequently $p = q$, a contradiction. $\Box$

By the previous Lemma Σ is represented by the graph of a holomorphic function over Ω. Let us denote by u (respectively v) the real (respectively the imaginary) part of this function. The following Lemma is an immediate consequence of the results in [6]:

Lemma 2.10 *Ω is simply connected.*

Proof. Observe that, if Ω is not simply connected, then $D \cap \Omega$ is not simply connected for some open disc $D \subset \mathbb{C}_z$. Arguing as in the previous Lemma, we prove that $\tau(\Sigma)$ is properly embedded on some subdomain

$$D \times (-R, R) \subset \mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u, \ R >> 0$$

(again, under the hypothesis of Theorem 2.2 this is a direct consequence of the assumption). But $\tau(\Sigma)$ is the graph of u over $D \cap \Omega$; since v is a single-valued harmonic conjugate of u, we can apply Lemma 3.3 of [6] to obtain that $D \cap \Omega$ is in fact simply connected. $\Box$

Because of the previous Lemma, we can consider a biholomorphic map $\mathfrak{R} : \Omega \to \Delta$, where $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the unit disc. Our aim is to apply Lemma 2.8 and in order to do so we must examine the behavior of $\mathfrak{R}$ near the boundary of Ω.

2.4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Lemma 2.11 *Let C be a connected component of the boundary of Ω. Then there exist a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of C in $\overline{\Omega}$ such that either $u > 0$ on $\mathcal{U}$ or $u < 0$ on $\mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. Let K be a compact connected subset C; it is enough to prove that the thesis holds for any such K. Observe that, since Ω is connected, $C \setminus K$ has at most two connected components. By Corollary 2.7, for any $z \in K$

there exist a disc $D(z,\varepsilon)$ such that $|u|>0$ on $D(z,\varepsilon)\cap\Omega$; thus K can be covered by a finite set $\{D_1,\ldots,D_k\}$ of such discs. If δ is small enough, then

$$\mathcal{U}'=\{z\in\mathbb{C}:d(z,K)<\delta\}\subset D_1\cup\ldots\cup D_k.$$

The thesis then follows from the fact that there is a connected component of $\mathcal{U}'\cap\Omega$ whose boundary contains K. Suppose that this is not the case, and choose a connected component $\mathcal{V}$ of $\mathcal{U}'\cap\Omega$ such that $E=b\mathcal{V}\cap K\neq\emptyset$. Observe that $b\mathcal{V}=E\cup F\cup G$, where

$$F=b\mathcal{V}\cap\{z\in\mathbb{C}:d(z,K)=\delta\}\text{ and }G=b\mathcal{V}\cap C\setminus K;$$

obviously $E\cap F=\emptyset$ and thus G has at least two connected component. Moreover, E is connected since otherwise $C\setminus K$ would have more than two connected components. But if $E\subsetneq K$ is connected then it can touch at most one connected component of $C\setminus K$ and thus of G; it follows $E=K$. $\square$

Corollary 2.12 *Let C be a connected component of $b\Omega$. Then there is a fundamental system $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of neighborhoods of C in $\overline{\Omega}$ such that either*

$$\inf_{\mathcal{V}_n}u\to+\infty$$

or

$$\sup_{\mathcal{V}_n}u\to-\infty$$

as $n\to\infty$.

Proof. This is a consequence of Corollary 2.7 and Lemma 2.11. $\square$

Remark 2.4 In the previous statement, we can assume that $\mathcal{V}_n$ and $\Omega\setminus\mathcal{V}_n$ are connected for every n. We can also assume that the sequence $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing, with $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{n+1}\subset\mathcal{V}_n$ (where the closure is taken in Ω).

Now we fix our attention to the sequence $\{\mathcal{W}_n=\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{V}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of domains of D. For each $n\in N$, we define

$$\Lambda_n=\overline{\mathcal{W}}_n\cap bD$$

where the closure of $\mathcal{W}_n$ is taken in $\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 2.13 $\{\Lambda_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is a non-increasing sequence of closed, connected subsets of bD; moreover, $\Lambda_n\neq\emptyset$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. We prove various points separately:

- each Λ_n is closed by definition, and the sequence is non-increasing by Remark 2.4;
- $\Lambda_n \neq \emptyset$ for, in the opposite case, we would have $\mathcal{W}_n \Subset D$, which implies that $\mathfrak{R}$ is not proper. This is a contradiction because $\mathfrak{R}$ is a biholomorphism;
- Λ_n is connected because otherwise we would have that

  $$D \setminus \mathcal{W}_n = \mathfrak{R}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{V}_n)$$

  is not connected, which would contradict the choice of $\mathcal{V}_n$ (see Remark 2.4). Indeed, suppose that Λ' and Λ'' are two disjoint connected components of Λ_n, and choose a simple arc $\gamma \subset \mathcal{W}_n$ joining a point of Λ' and a point of Λ''. Then $D \setminus \gamma$ has two connected components D_1 and D_2, and we must have $D_j \cap (D \setminus \mathcal{W}_n) \neq \emptyset$ for $j = 1, 2$ since Λ' and Λ'' are disconnected. This implies that $D \setminus \mathcal{W}_n$ is disconnected.

□

From the previous Lemma it follows that, if we set

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_n$$

then Λ is a closed, non-empty interval of bD. A priori, Λ could be reduced to a single point of bD. In order to apply Lemma 2.8, we must prove that this is not the case.

Lemma 2.14 *The interval $\Lambda \subset bD$ is not reduced to a point.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction and assume that $\Lambda = \{z_0\}$ with $z_0 \in bD$. Observe that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}_n \subset D(z_0, \varepsilon) \cap D \ \forall n \geq N,$$

where $D(z_0, \varepsilon)$ is the disc centered at z_0 with radius ε. Indeed, in the opposite case there would exist (cfr. Remark 2.4) $p \in D$ such that $p \in \mathcal{W}_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and this is not possible since $\mathcal{V}_n$ is a fundamental system of neighborhoods of C. Now consider, on D, the holomorphic function $f(z) = z - z_0$, and let $g \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ be defined by $g = f \circ \mathfrak{R}$. Then, by the choice of f and the previous observation, g extends to $\Omega \cup C$ as a continuous function putting $g \equiv 0$ on

C. Choose a point $w \in C$ and consider a disc $D' = D(w, \varepsilon)$ such that $D' \setminus C$ is disconnected. Define a function $\widetilde{g} : D' \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widetilde{g}(z) = \begin{cases} g(z), & z \in \overline{\Omega} \cap D'; \\ 0, & z \in D' \setminus \overline{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

Then $\widetilde{g}$ is continuous. Moreover, by definition $\widetilde{g}$ is holomorphic outside the set $\{\widetilde{g} = 0\}$; therefore, by Rado's Theorem, $\widetilde{g} \in \mathcal{O}(D')$. Since $\{\widetilde{g} \overset{\circ}{=} 0\} \neq \emptyset$, we have $\widetilde{g} \equiv 0$ on D' and consequently $g \equiv 0$ on Ω, which is a contradiction. □

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 2.2: Lemma 2.14 allows us to apply Lemma 2.8 and deduce that u cannot be unbounded on Ω. By Corollary 2.7 we have that $\Omega = \mathbb{C}_z$ and thus π is onto. Lemma 2.9 implies that π is one to one, therefore we can apply Lemma 2.4 and conclude that $\Sigma = \{w = c\}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$, whence the thesis of Theorem 2.1. □

2.5 The result in $\mathbb{C}^n$

The statement of Theorem 2.1 can be generalized to the case when S is a Levi-flat hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Consider holomorphic coordinates $(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}, w) = (z, w)$, $z_j = x_j + iy_j$, $w = u + iv$, and let $\rho : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that $S = \{v = \rho(z, u)\}$ is a Levi-flat graph. Then we can restate almost verbatim Theorem 2.1:

Theorem 2.15 *S is foliated by complex hyperplanes, i.e. ρ has the form*

$$\rho(z, u) = \varrho(u)$$

for some smooth function $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. This is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.1. Indeed, let $p_1 = (z_1, u)$ and $p_2 = (z_2, u)$ be two points in $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$ with the same u-coordinate, and consider the complex line $L \subset \mathbb{C}^{n-1}_z$ such that $z_1, z_2 \in L$. Then the restriction of ρ to $L \times \mathbb{R}_u$ has a Levi-flat graph

$$S_L = S \cap (L \times \mathbb{C}_w) \subset L \times \mathbb{C}_w \cong \mathbb{C}^2.$$

Theorem 2.1 applies to S_L, showing that $\rho|_{L \times \mathbb{R}_u}$ is a function of u and thus that $\rho(p_1) = \rho(p_2)$. This proves the thesis. □

2.6 Generalization to a continuous graph

The arguments of the previous sections work in the case that ρ is at least of class C^2. However, it is possible to generalize the result to the case of a continuous graph. In order to achieve this, the Main Theorem of Shcherbina's paper [6] (which gives also a description of the leaves of the foliation of the polynomial hull of a graph in $\mathbb{C}^2$) can be applied, rather than Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. We say that a continuous hypersurface $S \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ (i.e. a subset which is locally a graph of a continuous function over an open subset of a real hyperplane of $\mathbb{C}^n$) is *Levi flat* if it (locally) separates $\mathbb{C}^n$ in two pseudoconvex domains. Note that, in the case $n = 2$, S is locally the union of a disjoint family of complex discs (see again [6], Corollary 1.1). So, let $\rho : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $S = \{v = \rho(z, u)\}$ is a Levi flat graph. Then, as before, we have

Theorem 2.16 *S is foliated by complex hyperplanes, i.e. ρ has the form*

$$\rho(z, u) = \varrho(u)$$

for some continuous function $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Once again it is sufficient to show that the statement is true for $n = 2$. In this case we do not know a priori whether S has a foliated atlas; nevertheless, since each $p \in S$ is contained in a germ of holomorphic curve $\Sigma_p \subset S$ (and this germ is unique in view of Lemma 4.1 of [6]) we can still consider the maximal connected surface Σ that passes through p. Our aim is to carry out an analysis of Σ similar to that delivered in the previous sections for the C^2 case. First of all, we want to generalize Lemma 2.3:

Lemma 2.17 *Let Σ be any leaf of the foliation of S. Then the projection $\pi|_\Sigma$ is a local homeomorphism.*

Proof. In this case the fact that $\partial/\partial v \in T(\Sigma)$ does not give a contradiction, since S is only a continuous graph. Instead, we rely on the Main Theorem of [6] Let $p \in \Sigma$, $p = (p_1, p_2)$, B a ball in $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$ containing the point $(p_1, \mathsf{Re}p_2)$ and consider $\rho|_{bB}$. Then Shcherbina's Theorem applies to $\gamma = \Gamma(\rho|_{bB})$, hence by the point (ii) of that statement it follows that the disc through p is a graph over a domain of $\mathbb{C}_z$. $\square$

As before, we define $\Omega = \pi(\Sigma)$ and we prove that $\pi|_\Sigma^{-1}$ is single-valued and that Ω is simply connected.

Lemma 2.18 *Let Ω and Σ be as above. Then $\pi|_\Sigma^{-1}(z)$ consists of a point for every $z \in \Omega$.*

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 2.9. Suppose that, for some $z \in \Omega$, there exist $p, q \in \Sigma$ $(p \neq q)$ such that $\pi(p) = \pi(q) = z$. We choose an arc $\widetilde{\gamma}$ joining p and q, with $\gamma = \pi \circ \widetilde{\gamma}$ the corresponding loop in Ω. Let B be a ball in $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$, centered at z, with a large enough radius such that $\gamma \subset B$ and $\tau \circ \widetilde{\gamma} \subset B$. Then

$$S \cap \tau^{-1}(B) = \Gamma(\rho|_B) \subset \mathbb{C}^2$$

is the Levi-flat surface which has the graph

$$S \cap \tau^{-1}(bB) = \Gamma(\rho|_{bB})$$

as boundary. Since, by Shcherbina's Main Theorem, $S \cap \tau^{-1}(B)$ is the disjoint union of discs which are graphs on $\mathbb{C}_z$, we must have $p = q$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 2.19 *Ω is simply connected.*

Proof. As in the previous case, we assume by contradiction that $D \cap \Omega$ is not simply connected for some open disc $D \subset \mathbb{C}_z$. We choose a ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$ such that $B \cap \mathbb{C}_z = D$. Then, by point (ii) of Shcherbina's Main Theorem, the leaves of $S \cap \tau^{-1}(B)$ are graphs over simply connected domains of $\mathbb{C}_z$. It follows that

$$D \cap \Omega = \pi(\Sigma \cap \tau^{-1}(B))$$

must be simply connected. $\square$

Now we prove the analogous of Lemma 2.5:

Lemma 2.20 *Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_z$ and suppose that there exist p_0 such that $\pi(p_0) = z_0$ and p_0 is a cluster point for Σ. Then $z_0 \in \Omega$.*

Proof. In this case we can actually prove that $p_0 \in \Sigma$, i.e. Σ is a closed surface. Ideed, consider a ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$ which is centered at $\tau(p_0)$. Then $S_B = S \cap \tau^{-1}(B) = \Gamma(\rho|_B)$ is a union of disjoint complex discs which are graphs over domains of $\mathbb{C}_z$. Since Σ is a graph over $\mathbb{C}_z$ and contains points of S_B, it must contain exactly one of those discs, which has to be the one passing through p_0, p_0 being a cluster point. Then $p_0 \in \Sigma$. $\square$

Keeping the notation adopted in section 2.1, we then have, with the same proof as 2.7, the following

Corollary 2.21 *Let $z_0 \in b\Omega$, and let $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a fundamental system of neighborhoods of z_0 in $\mathbb{C}_z$. Then for any $M > 0$ there exists $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|u(z)| > M$ for all $z \in \Omega \cap \mathcal{U}_k$ with $k \geq K_0$.*

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.16 goes exactly as in the previous case.

3 Foliations of $D \times \mathbb{C}$

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the unit disc. As seen in the section 1, the methods of analytic multifunctions allow to prove a "Liouville result" for Levi flat manifolds contained in $D \times \mathbb{C}$ by considering them "as a whole". In such a case, since the leaves of the foliation are uniquely determined, we obtain immediately that the these leaves are complex lines. In what follows, we want to consider smooth foliations of $D \times \mathbb{C}$ by complex curves. In this case the global object defines a constant multifunction, but this does not imply that the foliation is trivial. So, in order to show that - under natural topological restriction - this is the case, we need to study the foliation "leaf-by-leaf" as done in section 2.

We observe that, even though The kind of foliations we treat is not perhaps the most general case in which a result of Liouville's type can be obtained, nevertheless the methods of multifunctions do not apply directly.

Choose holomorphic coordinates (z, w) in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that D is the unit disc on $\mathbb{C}_z$:

Definition 3.1 *We say that a 2-dimensional real foliation of $D_z \times \mathbb{C}_w$ is* regular *if, for any leaf Σ of the foliation, the following conditions are fulfilled:*

(i) *for any open subset $U \Subset \mathbb{C}_w$, every connected component of $S \cap (D_z \times U)$ is (up to a possible shrinking of U) a compact 2-manifold with boundary which has positive distance from $bD_z \times \mathbb{C}_w$;*

(ii) *there exists a ball $B \Subset \mathbb{C}_w$ such that every connected component of*

$$\Sigma \cap (D_z \times (\mathbb{C}_w \setminus B))$$

is finitely branched over D_z.

Roughly speaking, condition (i) says that the foliation has to be defined only on the cylinder, in such a way that it is not possible to "extend it further". Condition (ii) guarantees a nice behavior at infinity. A leaf is allowed to approach the boundary of the cylinder, but only along paths which are not contained in any compact set.

We say that a 2-dimensional foliation on $D_z \times \mathbb{C}_w$ is *trivial* if all the leaves are of the form $\{z = c\}$.

Theorem 3.2 *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a (real) 2-dimensional regular foliation on $D \times \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that all the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ are complex manifolds. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is trivial.*

In order to prove the Theorem we concentrate on a single leaf and prove that it must be of the form $\{z = c\}$. So, let Σ be a leaf of $\mathcal{F}$. We have the following

Lemma 3.3 *Let $L \neq \mathbb{C}_z$ be a complex line, and denote by π the orthogonal projection over L. Then $\pi|_\Sigma$ is onto.*

Proof. We shall argue as in the proof of Lemma 1.5. Since $\pi|_\Sigma$ is a holomorphic function we have that $\pi(\Sigma) = \Omega$ is an open subset of L. Let $p \in b\Omega$, and let B be any ball of L centered at p. Then, by the hypothesis $L \neq \mathbb{C}_z$, defining

$$U = \pi^{-1}(B \cap \Omega) \cap (D \times \mathbb{C})$$

we have $U \Subset \mathbb{C}^2$ and thus the connected components of $\Sigma \cap U$ have positive distance from $bD \times \mathbb{C}$. Let Σ' be one of these components; then $\pi(\Sigma') = \Omega \cap B$. Otherwise, we would have $\pi(S') = \Omega'$ where $\Omega' \subset \Omega \cap B$ is an open subset. Take $q \in b\Omega' \setminus b(\Omega \cap B)$; then, arguing exactly as in the proof of Lemma 1.5 (taking in account the fact that, since $L \neq \mathbb{C}_z$, any complex line which is orthogonal to L and contains points of $D \times \mathbb{C}$ touches $bD \times \mathbb{C}$), we have $q \in \pi(\Sigma')$. It follows that $p \in \overline{\pi(\Sigma')}$. Arguing again as in 1.5 we conclude that $p \in \pi(\Sigma')$, hence $p \in \pi(\Sigma)$. $\square$

The previous Lemma suggests to consider Σ as an analytic multifunction defined over $\mathbb{C}_w$ (or any complex line $L \neq \mathbb{C}_z$). However, while $\overline{\Sigma}$ is actually an analytic multifunction, it may have non-empty interior: Σ may be even dense on $D \times \mathbb{C}$, in which case the fact that $\overline{\Sigma}$ is a constant multifunction gives no information.

So, we proceed as follows. Let $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ be the universal covering of Σ. By Riemann's uniformization Theorem, $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ is either $\mathbb{C}$ or the unit disc D. In the first case the thesis would follow immediately, since the lift of $z|_\Sigma$ to $\widetilde{S}$ would be a bounded holomorphic function on $\widetilde{\Sigma} \cong \mathbb{C}$, hence constant. Then, let us suppose $\widetilde{\Sigma} \cong D$. Let $f_1, f_2 : D \to \mathbb{C}$ be defined in such a way that $f = (f_1, f_2) : D \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is the covering map $D \to \Sigma$. Then f_1, f_2 are holomorphic functions, f_1 is bounded (by 1) and, by Lemma 3.3, f_2 is onto.

We consider a complex parametrization of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2) \setminus \mathbb{C}_w$ (i.e. the complex linear subsets different from $\mathbb{C}_w$) given by $v_\eta = (\eta, 1)$, $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$. We project Σ along each of the lines of this parametrization, i.e. we consider, for any $\zeta \in D$,

$$\left\langle f(\zeta), v_\eta^\perp \right\rangle = \left\langle (f_1(\zeta), f_2(\zeta)), (1, -\overline{\eta}) \right\rangle = f_1(\zeta) - \eta f_2(\zeta).$$

Denote by F the function $D_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by the previous expression, i.e. $F(\zeta, \eta) = f_1(\zeta) - \eta f_2(\zeta)$. Then F is a holomorphic function, whose zero locus is a 1-dimensional analytic subset $\mathcal{Z}$ of $D_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta$. $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}$ is an analytic multifunction. Since

$$\overline{\mathcal{Z}} \cap (D \times \mathbb{C}_z) = \mathcal{Z}$$

the property that $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a constant multifunction would imply that $\mathcal{Z}$ is constant, i.e. union of complex lines (which is not true for Σ). Unfortunately, it can occur that $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}$ contains $bD_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta$. In such a case we would have $\widehat{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}} = D_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta$ (that is, $\widehat{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}}$ is a constant multifunction as expected), but we could not conclude anything about $\mathcal{Z}$. The difficulty behind this obstacle is that, in this case, it is not sufficient to "test" the behavior of $\mathcal{Z}$ by plurisubharmonic functions defined in a neighborhood of $D_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta$, since they can "detect what happens" only in their maximum sets, i.e., in our case, $bD_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta$. Then, we need to analyze $\mathcal{Z}$ in more detail.

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset D_\zeta$ be the subset

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\zeta \in D : f_1(\zeta) = f_2(\zeta) = 0\};$$

then $\mathcal{A}$ is a discrete subset of D_ζ. Observe that $\mathcal{Z}$ can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{(\zeta, \eta) \in D \times \mathbb{C} : \zeta \in \mathcal{A}\} \cup \{(\zeta, \eta) \in D \times \mathbb{C} : \eta = f_1(\zeta)/f_2(\zeta)\}$$

i.e. $\mathcal{Z}$ is the union of a discrete family of complex lines and the graph of a meromorphic function over D_ζ. Denote by $\mathcal{Z}'$ this graph. Clearly $\mathcal{Z}'$ is a 1-dimensional complex submanifold of

$$D_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta \setminus \{(\zeta, \eta) : f_2(\zeta) = 0\},$$

and possibly extends as a submanifold of a bigger domain (it extends through the complex lines $\{\zeta = c\}$ for which $c \in \mathcal{A}$ and the order of zero of f_1 at c is bigger than or equal to the one of f_2). We then take as $\mathcal{Z}'$ the maximal possible extension on a subdomain of $D_\zeta \times \mathbb{C}_\eta$.

Lemma 3.4 *Up to a change of coordinates on* $\mathbb{C}^2 = \mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{C}_w$*, for the resulting* F *and* $\mathcal{Z}'$ *the following is true:*

- $\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} F(\zeta, 0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} f_1(\zeta) \neq 0$*;*
- *there exists a small ball* $B_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{C}_\eta$*, centered at* 0*, such that every connected component of* $\mathcal{Z}' \cap (D_\zeta \times B_\varepsilon)$ *intersects* $\eta = 0$*;*
- *every one of such connected components is a compact manifold with boundary, which is a finite branched covering of* B_ε*.*

Proof. We perform a coordinate change on D_z such that the line $\{z = 0\}$ intersects Σ transversally at some point (this coordinate change exists, since otherwise we would have that $\Sigma = \{z = c\}$ for some $c \in D_z$); in this way the first condition is assured. Then, we choose ε small enough in such a way that, for any $\eta \in B_\varepsilon$, we have that

$$L_\eta \cap (bD_z \times \mathbb{C}_w) \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus (B \times D_z),$$

where L_η is the complex line of $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{C}_w$ parametrized by η and B is the one in Definition 3.1. The choice of ε implies that the last two assertions are satisfied. In fact, Definition 3.1 implies that, for each connected component $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{Z}' \cap (D_\zeta \times B_\varepsilon)$, the fibres of the projection $\pi : \mathcal{W} \to B_\varepsilon$ are finite. Moreover, from our construction it follows that $\pi(\mathcal{W})$ includes $B_\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}$ (this is a consequence of the following two facts: the intersection of Σ with L_η is stable, and $L_\eta \cap (D_z \times \mathbb{C}_w)$ is compact for $\eta \neq 0$). Since $\mathcal{W}$ is a finitely ramified covering of $B_\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}$, it extends to $D_\zeta \times B_\varepsilon$. Indeed, to see this it is sufficient to observe that the symmetric functions on the ζ-coordinates of the fibres of $\pi : \mathcal{W} \to B_\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}$ are bounded, holomorphic function on $B_\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}$, thus they extend to B_ε. Since $\mathcal{Z}'$ is closed, $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \subset \mathcal{Z}'$ and therefore the connected components of $\mathcal{Z}' \cap (D_\zeta \times B_\varepsilon)$ satisfy the last two conditions of the Lemma. $\square$

Now we define

$$G(\zeta, \eta) = F(\zeta, \eta) - F(0, \eta) = f_1(\zeta) - \eta(f_2(\zeta) - f_2(0))$$

and denote again by $\mathcal{Z}'$ the graph part of the zero locus of G. Observe that the arguments of Lemma 3.4 work for G as well, and that G satisfies

- $G(0, \eta) \equiv 0$
- $\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} G(\zeta, \eta) \neq 0$ for η in a neighborhood of 0;
- for $\eta \neq 0$, $G(\cdot, \eta) : D \to \mathbb{C}$ is onto;
- for $\eta = 0$, $G(\cdot, 0) = f_1$ is bounded (by 1).

We will show that these properties combined with the conclusions of Lemma 3.4 give a contradiction.

In order to do this, we need two intermediate Lemmas on the holomorphic functions on D which are consequences of the classical Schwarz Lemma.

3.1 Lemmas on holomorphic functions on D

Let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D)$, $f \not\equiv 0$. Then the zero locus of f is a countable, discrete subset of D. We set

$$f^{-1}(0) = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n, \ldots)$$

where

- $f(a_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$;
- all the zeroes are listed except 0 if $f(0) = 0$;
- the a_i's are listed by non-decreasing modulus;
- if k is the multiplicity of a_i, then a_i is listed k times.

Obviously, the infinite product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i|$$

converges to some non-negative real number. We denote it by $\Pi_0 f$. Our aim is to study the behavior of $\Pi_0 f$ in some cases, first of all, when $f : D \to \mathbb{C}$ is onto.

We say that f is *semi-proper* if, for any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{C}$, every connected component of $f^{-1}(K)$ is a compact subset of D. Every proper map is semi-proper; however, in our setting the first property is not relevant, since there is no proper holomorphic map from D onto $\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 3.5 *Let $f : D \to \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic, surjective semi-proper map. Suppose that $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0) \neq 0$. Then $\Pi_0 f = 0$.*

Proof. Choose a ball $B = B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{C}$, centered at 0 and with radius $R >> 0$. Let C be the connected component of $f^{-1}(\overline{B})$ containing $0 \in D$; by hypothesis C is a compact subset of D. It is easily seen that $f : C \to \overline{B}$ is a finite ramified covering of $\overline{B}$, thus for any $z \in B$ we may consider the finite set $f^{-1}(z) \cap C = \{w_1(z), \ldots, w_s(z)\}$. Define $g : B \to D$ as

$$g(z) = w_1(z) \cdot \ldots \cdot w_s(z).$$

Then g is a well defined holomorphic function on B; moreover, by hypothesis $g(0) = 0$. In view of Schwarz's Lemma,

$$|g'(0)| \leq 1/R. \tag{2}$$

Now observe that, by hypothesis, f is a local homeomorphism near $0 \in D$. Therefore, in a small neighborhood U of 0 in $\mathbb{C}$, g can be written as $g = g_1 \cdot g_2$, where g_1 is a local inverse of f such that $g_1(0) = 0$. Taking the first derivative, we have

$$g'(0) = g_1'(0)g_2(0) + g_1(0)g_2'(0) = g_1'(0)\prod\{w : w \in f^{-1}(0) \cap C \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

Let $k = |g_1'(0)|$; by hypothesis $k \neq 0$ and, moreover, it clearly does not depend on the choice of R. By (2) we obtain

$$\left|\prod\{w : w \in f^{-1}(0) \cap C \setminus \{0\}\}\right| \leq \frac{1}{kR}.$$

For $R \to \infty$ we find that the product of the modulus of a (possibly proper) subset of $f^{-1}(0) \setminus \{0\}$ is vanishing; hence, a fortiori, $\Pi_0 f = 0$. $\square$

The following result is in some sense the counterpart of Lemma 3.5. It shows that if f is bounded and $f'(0) \neq 0$ then $\Pi_0 f \neq 0$. Indeed,

Lemma 3.6 *Let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D)$ be a bounded holomorphic function on the unit disc. Suppose that $f(0) = 0$ and $\Pi_0 f = 0$. Then $f'(0) = 0$.*

Proof. Choose $M > 0$ such that $|f(z)| \leq M$ for all $z \in D$. We first prove the Lemma in the case that $f \in \mathcal{O}(D) \cap C^0(\overline{D})$. For any $a_i \in f^{-1}(0) \setminus \{0\}$, we choose a holomorphic automorphism ϕ_{a_i} of the disc, of the form

$$\phi_{a_1} = \frac{\alpha_i z + \beta_i}{\overline{\beta}_i z - \overline{\alpha}_i}, \alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{C},$$

in such a way that $\phi_{a_i}(a_i) = 0$. Observe that the following properties hold:

- the vanishing order of ϕ_{a_i} at a_i is 1;
- $|\phi_{a_i}(z)| = 1$ for $z \in bD$;
- $|\phi_{a_i}(0)| = |a_i|$.

Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ and take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough such that

$$|a_1| \cdot |a_2| \cdot \ldots \cdot |a_N| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Define a holomorphic function g in the following way:

$$g(z) = \frac{f(z)}{\phi_{a_1}(z) \cdot \phi_{a_2}(z) \cdot \ldots \cdot \phi_{a_N}(z)};$$

g is well defined and holomorphic in D because ϕ_{a_i} vanishes only at a_i (of order 1). Moreover,

$$|g(z)| = \frac{|f(z)|}{|\phi_{a_1}(z)| \cdot |\phi_{a_2}(z)| \cdot \ldots \cdot |\phi_{a_N}(z)|} = |f(z)| \leq M \ \forall z \in bD,$$

thus $|g| \leq M$ on the whole disc D. Since $g(0) = 0$, by Schwarz's Lemma we obtain that $|g'(0)| \leq M$. Then, taking the first derivative of f and defining

$$\Phi_N = \phi_{a_1} \cdot \phi_{a_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot \phi_{a_N}$$

we have

$$|f'(0)| = |g'(0)\Phi_N(0) + g(0)\Phi'_N(0)| = |g'(0)| \cdot |\phi_{a_1}(0) \cdot \phi_{a_2}(0) \cdot \ldots \cdot \phi_{a_N}(0)| =$$

$$= |g'(0)| \cdot (|a_1| \cdot |a_2| \cdot \ldots \cdot |a_N|) \leq M\varepsilon.$$

Then, letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ we obtain the thesis when f is continuous up to the boundary. The general case is obtained by applying the same proof to $f_\delta(z) = f((1-\delta)z)$ and letting $\delta \to 0$. $\square$

Remark 3.1 The proof of the previous Lemma is analogous to the one of the classical Schwarz lemma: indeed, the method is to get rid of the zeroes of f by dividing by a suitable holomorphic function Φ, and then apply the maximum principle. However, the choice of Φ needs (a bit of) care, since, for example, dividing by $1/(z - a_i)$ does not allow to obtain the right estimate.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Keeping the notations introduced in the previous sections, let

$$\Pi(\eta) = \Pi_0 G(\cdot, \eta).$$

As already observed, by Lemma 3.3 $G(\cdot, \eta) : D \to \mathbb{C}$ is onto for $\eta \neq 0$; moreover, condition (i) in definition 3.1 implies that $G(\cdot, \eta)$ is semi-proper. Hence Lemma 3.5 applies to $G(\cdot, \eta)$, showing that

$$\Pi(\eta) = 0 \ \forall \eta \neq 0.$$

If we prove that $\Pi(0) = 0$, then we are in position to apply Lemma 3.6 and obtain that $f_1'(0) = 0$ (where f_1 is the first component of the covering map $D \to \Sigma$ introduced earlier), which is a contradiction. So, our purpose is to show that $\Pi(0) = 0$, and for this that $\Pi(\eta)$ is continuous at $0 \in \mathbb{C}_\eta$.

Observe that by Lemma 3.4 we have that $\mathscr{Z}' \cap (D_\zeta \times B_\varepsilon)$ is made up, for small ε, of countable many connected components, each of them being a finite ramified covering of B_ε. For each one of those connected components $\mathscr{Z}'_i$, we define $g_i \in \mathcal{O}(B_\varepsilon)$ as

$$g_i(\eta) = \prod_{(\zeta,\eta)\in\mathscr{Z}'_i} \zeta;$$

clearly

$$\Pi(\eta) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} |g_i(\eta)|$$

for $\eta \in B_\varepsilon$. The thesis is then a consequence of the following Lemma:

Lemma 3.7 *Let $g_i \in \mathcal{O}(B_\varepsilon)$ be defined as before. Then the product of the g_i's is continuous in $\eta = 0$.*

Proof. Denote by G_k the product of the first k functions,

$$G_k(\eta) = g_1(\eta) \cdot g_2(\eta) \cdot \ldots \cdot g_k(\eta).$$

Since $|g_i| < 1$ on B_ε, the sequence of functions $|G_k|$ is monotone decreasing. Moreover, the sequence G_k is uniformly bounded, hence by Montel's Theorem there is a subsequence G_{k_j} which converges uniformly to a continuous (holomorphic) function G. Since we already know that $\Pi(\eta) = 0$ for $\eta \neq 0$, it follows that $G \equiv 0$ on B_ε. Therefore, since $|G_k|$ is a decreasing sequence which admits a subsequence convergent to zero, we conclude that $|G_k| \to 0$ (uniformly in η), i.e.

$$\Pi(0) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} |g_i(0)| = 0.$$

□

Remark 3.2 Part (ii) of Definition 3.1 is used only in Lemma 3.4, to assure that in a neighborhood of $\{\eta = 0\}$ the connected components of the zero locus $\mathscr{Z}'$ are well-behaved, i.e. they are a finite branched covering of a neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{C}_\eta$. This allows us to prove Lemma 3.7. We conjecture that (ii) is superfluous and the triviality result is still valid only under assumption (i) of Definition 3.1; however, our method does not work in this generality. This is due to the fact that, in general, a connected Riemann surface which is a branched covering of a neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{C}_\eta \setminus \{0\}$ may be not extendable through $\{\eta = 0\}$, even if ζ-coordinate of its points is bounded (see Example 3.1 below). In such a case the proof of Lemma 3.7 does not work.

Example 3.1 Consider, in $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{z = 0\}$, the set defined S by

$$w = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j} \sqrt{z - \frac{1}{j}}.$$

Here, we mean the following: for each $z \neq 0$ and each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we order arbitrarily the two roots r_1^j, r_2^j of $\sqrt{z - 1/j}$. For any function $c : \mathbb{N} \to \{0, 1\}$, we set

$$w(c) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j} r_{c(j)}^j;$$

this sum converges because $|r_{c(j)}^j|$ is bounded. Then S is the collection of the points $(w(c), z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and for all $c : \mathbb{N} \to \{0, 1\}$. This set is not a Riemann surface, since the fiber over $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ is not countable. However, any connected component S' of S is a Riemann surface, with branching points $z = 1/j$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, bounded in a neighborhood of $\{z = 0\}$. Clearly S' does not extend to through $\{\eta = 0\}$.

References

[1] David E. Barret and Takashi Inaba, *On the topology of compact smooth three-dimensional Levi-flat hypersurfaces*, J. Geom. Anal. 2 (1992), no. 6, 489-497

[2] Robert L. Bryant, *Levi-flat minimal hypersurfaces in two-dimensional complex space forms*, hundred years after Sophus Lie (Kyoto/Nara, 1999) Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 37, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2002, pp. 1-44.

[3] Guido Lupacciolu and Giuseppe Tomassini, *An extension Theorem for CR-functions*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 137 (1984), 257-263 (Italian, with English summary)

[4] Kiyosi Oka, *Note sur les familles de fonctions analytiques multiformes*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A 4 (1934) 93-98

[5] Thomas Ransford, *A new approach to analytic multifunctions*, Set-Valued Anal. 7 (1999), no. 2, 159-194

[6] Nikolay V. Shcherbina, *On the polynomial hull of a graph*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 42 (1993), no. 2, 477-503

[7] Zbigniew Slodkowski, *Analytic set-valued functions and spectra*, Math. Ann. 256 (1981), no. 3, 363-386

[8] Gabriel Stolzenberg, *Uniform approximation on smooth curves*, Acta Math. 115 (1966), 185-198